

VIMALAPRABHĀ
ON THE LAGHUKĀLACAKRATANTRA 2.7.161-180
A REVIEW*

The *Laghukālacakratāntra* (=LKT) of Mañjuśrīyaśas (=M) deals with all the fundamentals of the tantra and the commentary on it by Puṇḍarīka (=P) the *Vimalaprabhā* (=V) makes it encyclopaedic by covering several allied topics also, while dealing with other principles, comments on the section under our discussion e. g. a few schools of Indian philosophy-Vedic and non-Vedic. Treatment of the systems in the V requires an intensive examination.

M takes up the philosophical schools of the *Vajrin* (=Buddhism), Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, *Amaraguru* (=Cārvaka), Rahman (=Islam) & Kṣapaṇaka successively. Fundamentals of Buddhism lie in 2.7.160, P comments on it that "on the conventional level tenets of all the philosophical schools are equally good for worldly attainments. As it goes – "To whichever object goes the mind of a person, it gets transformed into it like the *viśvarūpamaṇi*. Thus the assumption of the objects is similar, in addition to it, the treatment of categories, sense organs etc. is also alike (in all the schools). In behaviour agent, instrument etc. are also similar. Therefore, there is no distinction in between the Buddhists and *Tīrthikas*, however, there is a distinction relating to

* This paper is based on the Part I of the only published text of LKT with V from our institution in 1986.

sūnyatā and *nairātmya* &c. 1" M confirms it in the second hemistich of the verse 177 of this very chapter and section.

*cittaṃ vai bhāvarāgaḥ sphaṭikavadupadhāt rāgatāṃ yāti yasmāt /
tasmād dharma na kaścit svaparakulagato yoginā dūṣaṇīyaḥ //*

Padmavajra ² (693 A.D.), Anaṅgavajra ³ (705 A.D.), Kuddālapāda ⁴ etc. also are of the same opinion.

This statement of P and the *siddhas* requires a discussion. The hypothesis appears very attractive externally. But mere declaration of parity in all the homo- and heterogeneous branches of knowledge is not enough. Observation of Nāgārjuna ⁵ that there is no distinction in meditation on the supreme level, as the *dharmadhātu* is indivisible, statement of Padmavajra ⁶ that one may meditate on any object prescribed even by Arhat, Śaiva, Pāsupata etc. or on any one else, etc. are almost identical to Patañjali's ⁷ views when he instructs to adopt the object of meditation according to one's own liking.

In spite of all such statements, it cannot be declared that the ultimate good of all the *svayūthyas* (sister-disciplines) and *paravādins* (heretics), is identical even on the supreme level e. g. Buddhist *nirvāṇa* or *buddhatva* is not equal to the *mokṣa* of Vedāntins, *apavarga* of Mīmāṃsakas and Naiyāyikas, *kaivalya* of Sāṃkhya and Yoga etc. & *vice versa*. It is quite apparent that an *ācārya* of one school and sub-school even, mercilessly criticises the doctrines of the

1. P : *Vimalaprabhā* : *Iha lokasaṃvṛtyā vicāryamāṇaḥ sarvadarśanasiddhāntaḥ samāno laukikasiddhaye, tad yathā —*

*yena yena hi bhāvena manaḥ saṃyujyate nṛṇāṃ /
tena tanmayatāṃ yāti viśvarūpo maṇir yathā //*
iti bhāvasaṅkalpaḥ samānaḥ, tathā dhātuvindriyādivicāro 'pi tulyaḥ, vyāvahārikaṃ kartṛkaraṇādikaṃ ca tulyam, buddhatīrthikayor viśeṣo nāsti, sūnyatā tattvaṃ prati viśeṣaḥ, sa ca nairātmyetyādi, p. 256.

2. *Guhyasiddhiḥ* 3.58, 4.51-52 in the *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi-Saṅgraha*, CIHTS, Saranath, Varanasi, 1987.

3. *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhiḥ* 1.23-24 in G.A.S.

4. *Acintyādvayakramopadeśaḥ*, verses 38-41, 90-92 in G.A.S.

5. Nāgārjuna : *Nirāupamyastavaḥ* 21. in *Bauddhastotrāsaṅgrahaḥ*, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1994.

6. Op. cit. 4.51-52.

7. *Pātāñjalayogadarśanam* 1.39, Gujarati Press, Bombay, 1927, *yathābhima-tadyānād vā*.

others. In fact the unification of different views is just an imposition of one's own supremacy on others, showing, like Puṣpadanta⁸ that all the minor tributary precepts merge with the main and major stream, ultimately diffusing in the ocean. It is therefore, in one way or the other mere confiscation of the heretic views. In the present context it means that the Vajrayāna *madhyamaka* principles are supreme which are meant for the best of talents, while others are inferior and meant for the dullards⁹. It is proper to say that even the birds of the same flock bear distinct feathers. This stand gets support from P himself when he opines a *Mādhyamaka* to repudiate the *Tīrthika* tenets through the arguments present in various texts of logic, while tenets similar to Buddhist ones conventionally or so, need not be condemned. Tibetan scholar mKhays. drub. rje also agrees in this regard¹⁰. In the same way emergence of the Vedas from different mouths of the Buddha, as described by M also negates their origin from Viṣṇu on one hand and on the other suggests their inferiority to the Buddhist canons as is the case with the treatises of the Śrāvaka- and Pratyekabuddha *yānas*. Therefore, accepting the favourables and repudiating the contradictory ones, have been the policy of the philosophers of all disciplines. Had it not been so, there would have been only one school of Indian philosophy without a second. Jaina scholars Mañibhadra¹¹ and Guṇaratna¹² also, though outwardly liberal, maintain all the differences. While introducing the teachings of the *Vajrin* (=the Buddha) in verse no. 161 (i. e. 2.7.161) of the LKT M enumerates ten fundamental principles which are *nairātmyam*, *karmavipākah*, *tribhavaḥ*, *śaḍgatih*, *dvādaśāṅgapratītya-samutpādaḥ*, *caturāryasatyāni*, *aṣṭāda-*

8. Puṣpadanta : *nṛṇām eko gamyas tvam asi payasām arṇava iva - Śivamahim-nastotram*. 7 d.

9. P : Vimalaprabhā p. 270, Vistaro 'nekā' nekapramāṇaśāstreṇa madhyamake-na nīrākaraṇīyas tīrthikānāṃ siddhāntaḥ. yaḥ saṃvṛtyā sambuddhavadānasamaḥ sa na dūṣaṇīyaḥ.

10. Ibid., p. 270 (footnote).

11. Mañibhadra : *Laghuvṛttih* on the *śaddarśanasamuccaya* of Haribhadra, p. 69, ed. Kameshwar Nath Mishra, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1979.

12. *Ye ye vastvaṃśāḥ parair aṅgikriyante, te sarve'pi sāpekṣāḥ santaḥ paramārthasatyatāṃ pratipadyante, nīrapekṣās tu anyonyena nīrasyamānā nabhona-līnāyanti* iti. Ibid., p. 85.

śāveṇikadharmāḥ, *pañcaskandhāḥ*, *trikāyaḥ* with the *sahajakāya* as the fourth and the *ajadā śūnyatā*. All these ten points have been very well taken up in the commentary.

In the first half of the following *kārikā* 162, M refers to the *brahmaṇaḥ deśanā* pointing out three main precepts of it, and in the second half is dealt with the *viṣṇoḥ deśanā* with its eight salient features. P notes both the sects as the *brahmataniyamaḥ* and the *vaiṣṇavataniyamaḥ*. The main three doctrines of the former are. 1. the self-origination of the Vedas, 2. different parts of the *puruṣa* as the origin points of mankind and 3. only the *yajñas* like *āsvamedha* etc. are the *dharma*. In the second half of it *viṣṇoḥ deśanā*, taken by P as *vaiṣṇavataniyamaḥ*, has been abstracted with its eight salient doctrines which are (1) a creator of the universe i.e. *kartā*, (2) existence of the self-*ātmā*, (3) auspicious and inauspicious actions-*karma*, (4) the category of time - *kālaḥ asti*, (5) earth etc. are the primordial cause, (6) the attributes *sattva* etc, (7) the state of absorption as void - *śūnyatā* and (8) giver of the results of the vicious & virtuous deeds.

So far as mere statement of the relevant doctrines of the two schools is concerned, it is alright. But the terms and the resources used and cited for the two require some examination. P takes the words of the root text quite correctly. Therefore, in some cases he is misled by M and sometimes he is noticed confused and unaware of the proper names & sources thereof. For example, M and P both mistake the *brahmaṇaḥ deśanā*, *brahmatata* for *Jaiminiya Mīmāṃsā*. Infact there is no school of Indian philosophy as the *brahmatata*. All the three points narrated under this school are the main doctrines of the *Mīmāṃsā/Pūrvamīmāṃsā* school. Self-origination of the Vedas, in other words the *apauruṣeyatva* has been treated very exhaustively in the very first chapter of the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras* of Jaimini and in the commentary thereon by Śābara¹³ and the followers. Buddhist logicians like Dharmakīrti have never committed such a mistake. He uses the terms *Jaimini*, *Jaiminiya*, *Mīmāṃsaka*, *Veda*, *Vaidika*¹⁴, *Śābara* etc. when dealing with the particular aspect of

13. Jaimini : *Mīmāṃsādarśanam*, Vol. I, Ānandāśrama edn., 1976, pp. 25-126.

14. Dharmakīrti : *Pramāṇavārttika [svārthānumāna - Pariccheda]*, ed. Dalsukh Bhai Malvaniya, Banaras Hindu University, 1959. (Appendix No. 3).

Mīmāṃsā. In the same way origin of mankind from different parts of the *puruṣa*, mistakenly taken as *brahman* by P comes from the *saṃhitās*¹⁵ themselves and is expressed likewise at many places in the *Mahābhārata*¹⁶, *Smṛtis* of Manu¹⁷ etc. and *Purāṇās*¹⁸. It is a very accepted doctrine of Hinduism as a whole. Laugākṣibhāskara, a later *Mīmāṃsaka*, very emphatically defines that only *yāga* etc. are the *dharma*¹⁹. It is on the basis of the Vedic *mantras* like - '*Agnihotraṃ juhuyāta svargakāmaḥ*' etc.²⁰. Compilers of the anthologies of Indian philosophical systems, Mādhava etc. also deal these doctrines under the *Mīmāṃsā* chapter. Actually they never mention anywhere *brahman* as a system of Indian philosophy. Most probably M and P both might be confused on the analogy of the trinity of gods - *tridevas* i. e. *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* & *Maheśvara* and would have ascribed one school of thought to *Brahmā* also as the *Vaiṣṇav* and *Śaiva* schools of philosophy and religion run after the two. The next disputed point of P is calling *viṣṇumata* as the *gītādharma*²¹. Although Sir R.G. Bhandarkar accepts the *Gītā* as 'the earliest exposition of *Bhakti* system of the *Ekāntika Dharma*'²² and S. N. Dasgupta also associates the *Bhagavad-gītā* with the doctrine of the '*Ekānti-Vaiṣṇavas*'²³, *Gītā* is not the source book of any *vaiṣṇava* school which originated even before P. So far as tracing out of some major or minor principles of any system is concerned, they can be found even in the Vedic *saṃhitās*, *upaniṣads*, *purāṇas* etc. Therefore, P is mistaken in this respect, though the *Gītā* is said to be recited by Kṛṣṇa Himself, an incarnation of *Viṣṇu*. All the eight characteristics assigned to the *vaiṣṇavamata* by P may be found common to almost all the systems

15. *Brāhmaṇo'sya mukham āsīt* etc. RV. 10.90.12, Vājasaneyī S. 31-11, Subālopaniṣad I.4.

16. *Mahābhārata*-Śāntiparvan 306.87.

17. *Manusmṛti* 1.31. ed. G.S. Nene, C.S. Sansthan, Varanasi, 1982.

18. *Śabdakalpādrumaḥ* Vol. IV under '*Varṇaḥ*', CSS Office, Varanasi, 1964.

19. *Yāgādīreva dharmāḥ*. *Arthasaṅgrahaḥ*, ed. K.N. Mishra, CVB, Varanasi, 1979.

20. *Māitri Saṃhitā* 6.36.

21. Op. cit., p. 257 (*gītādharme viṣṇumata*).

22. R.G. Bhandarkar : *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Indological Book House, Varanasi, 1965, p. 14.

23. S.N. Dasgupta : *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1975, p. 545.

of Hinduism²⁴, including several systems of Hindu philosophy and religion. Thus the principles of *vaiṣṇavamata* are overlapping, therefore, inapt. Words of the verse *śūnyatā naṣṭadharmā* is ambiguous which could not be satisfactorily explained even by scholars like mkhays-grup-rje of Tibet²⁵. Two small fragments of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*²⁶ and the *Nārada-parivṛāja ka*²⁷ *Upaniṣads* 'na paśyati' etc. and 'ekībhūtaḥ' etc. require an examination whether they suit to this context.

In the verse no. 163, the fundamentals of *śivasya deśanā* as given by M and taken as *īśvaramatam* by P have been described. The commentator says that *ṣaṣṭmārga* (six paths) etc. described as the *īśvaramatam* should be taken in addition to the eight ones given under the *vaiṣṇavamata*. Explanations of the words mainly *ṣaṣṭmārga*, *mantradeha*, *vidyā*, the three *padagatis*, *bindubheda* and *dvādaśa-granthibheda* occurring in verse 163 regarding *īśvaramatam* are quite strange and not in conformity with the principles of the *śaiva* schools known so far. Dasgupta²⁸, R.G. Bhandarkar²⁹ etc. described *Śaivism* in their own style, but K.C. Pande³⁰ dealt with all details giving eight *Śaiva* schools of major and minor forms and monistic, dualistic nature etc. The words counted hereabove have not been found in the meaning as interpreted by P. The words *ṣaṣṭmārga*, *mantradeha* etc. have been defined quite differently in the *Tattvaparakāśa*³¹ of Bhoja and even in the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*³² of Mādhava. David N.

24. Hinduism to be understood also as described by A. Wayman in his paper. 'The Buddhist Attitude towards Hinduism', in 'Studia Missionalia' Vol. 42, 1993, Roma.

25. Op. cit., p. 257, ft. 1 & 2.

26. *Ekībhavatī na paśyati yāhuḥ (ātmā)* - *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* upaniṣad 4.4.2.

27. (i) *Ekībhūtaḥ suṣuptasthaḥ prajānāghanavān sukhī / nityānandamayo'py ātmā sarvajīvaṅtarasthitaḥ // Nārada-parivṛājako-*
paniṣad 8.15.

(ii) *na paśyan nṛtyum paśyati, na rogaṁ noṭa duḥkhatām, Maitrāyaṇīya Up.* 7.11.

28. Op. cit., Vol. V.

29. Op. cit.

30. K.C. Pande : *An Outline of History of Śaiva Philosophy*, (reprint) Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1986.

31. Bhojaḥ : *Tattvaparakāśaḥ*, ed. K.N. Mishra, Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi, 1976.

32. Mādhava : *Sarvadarśanasāṅgrahaḥ*, ed. I. C. Vidyāsagar, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, V. E. 1986.

Lorenzen³³, on the basis of Rāmānuja's *bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.35-37, describes the *vāmamārga* tantric nature of the philosophy and practice of the *Kāpālas*. He explains a few words in the perspective of the *pañcamakāras* and tries to equate the same with the Buddhist tantric expressions. But as no part of the *Kāpālika* literature is available, no proper conclusions can be arrived at. However, it is clear that the meanings of the terms explained in this context by P herein, are not in conformity with those of the so far available literature, rather go against the tradition.

The other very important point to be noted in this context is that *śivasya deśanā* as given by M has been taken in a different way by Śaṅkarācārya, whose *bhāṣya* is 'the earliest Sanskrit philosophical literature'³⁴ as remarks Dasgupta, deals with the *īśvarakāraṇavāda*³⁵ in the beginning of his commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37 and gives the fundamentals correctly according to the tenets. He, too, has neither quoted these words nor explained them incorrectly. He used the technical terms of the *Pāśūpatasūtra*³⁶ while talking of the *Māheśvaras*.

The verse 164 accounts of the fundamentals of the Cārvākas - *Amaraguru* - *Bṛhaspati* - *deśanā* in the first half, and of *Rahmaṇ* - [*Rahmāna*=Islam] in the second half. Denial of the creator, of fruits of the deeds, enjoyment of the materials of the world as the main goal of life, no fruits of the actions after death, absence of any physique in the world hereafter, and the emergence of consciousness after the proper combination of elements, have been beautifully explained in the commentary. There is no controversy on the name of the first preceptor of Cārvākas i. e. Bṛhaspati, the synonym *Amaraguru* - the teacher of the gods - has been widely accepted as the founder of this school.

*tadvapuḥ pañcabhir mantraiḥ pañcakṛtyopayogibhiḥ /
tatpuruṣāghoravāmādyair mastakādīvai //* p. 83

33. Lorenzen : *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, California, (Indian reprint) 1972, pp. 2-3.

34. Dasgupta : op. cit., Vol. V, p. 1.

35. *Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣyam*, Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi, 1982, p. 565.

36. *Pāśūpatasūtra* with Kaunḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya* commentary, ed. R. Ananthakrishna Sastri, Trivandrum, University of Travancore, 1940, pp. 1-5, also see *Pāśūpatasūtram*, tr. Haripada Chakraborti, Academic Publications, Calcutta, 1970, p. 53.

Doctrines, too, counted down here in the verse are well accepted and have been produced, more or less, the same by other philosophers also while dealing with the *lokāyatamatam* i. e. *Cārvākamatam*. Thus M & P both borrow the doctrines of their school from Vedic and non-Vedic traditions as there is no *prasthānagrantha* (original text of the school) available so far of this system except Jayarāṣi's *Tattvopaplavasimha*, a later treatise which has been mostly quoted by later Jaina scholars. Three principal doctrines of Islam – 1. the compassionate one - *Rahmāna*-created the whole world, moving and stable, 2. the objects are for the use of the followers, and 3. gratification of *Rahmāna* provides Heaven, have been counted. However, there is no religious sect with the name of *Rahmāna*. *Rahamāna* is an epithet of *Allāh*, the Supreme Category of Islam. Therefore, here this stands for Islam religion of Muslims.

As far as I know, it is for the first time in the history of philosophical Sanskrit literature of the medieval India where Islamic doctrines have been referred to. Though M reads the word *Tāyi (ji) n* for the followers but P adds an adjective *mleccha* to this word. This word is used to express one's hatred towards anyone³⁷. Therefore, it may be guessed that by the time of P Buddhists were not in good terms with them. Principles are very basic ones and more would have been added for the clear picture of Islam.

In verse no. 165 have been dealt with thirteen major doctrines of Jainas. In all the terms denoting the doctrines like *traikālyā* (=three times), *dravyaṣaṭkam* (six substances), *navapada* (=nine destinations), *jīvaṣaṭkāyaleśyāḥ* (six corporal sufferings of the person), *pañcānyakāyāḥ* (other five bodies), kinds of *vrata* (vows), *saṃitiḥ* (councils), five *gatis* (destinations), *jñāna* (=knowledge) and *cāritra* (=practices) have been said as the path to liberation. Taking spirit of the size of the body (=jīvaḥ *kāyapramāṇaḥ*) and nonattainment of emancipation by the eternal soul through innumerable births, the principles of Jainism have been concluded. These have been based on the *Tattvārthasūtra* and the different kinds of all the categories have been very precisely advanced by P.

37. Aloka Parasher : *Mlecchas in Ancient India*.

Thus the fundamentals, as understood by M and P have been produced in five verses (161-165), hereafter in the following eleven ones (166-176) the author M and likewise the commentator have bitterly criticised the former religious doctrines respectively. P treats the *brāhma*, *vaiṣṇava* and *īśvara matas* as those of the *tīrthikas*. The author devotes two full verses i. e. 166-167 for repudiating the doctrines of the *brahmanmata*, condemning the self origination and eternity of the Vedas, eternal relation in between a word and its meaning, eternity and validity of the Vedas, *yoni*-purity of *Brāhmaṇas* ³⁸, and inaccessibility of the Vedas to all the castes, specially to *sūdras*.

Śāntarakṣita (749 A.D.) takes up the *śabdabrahmaparīkṣā* ³⁹, *śabdārthaparīkṣā* ⁴⁰ and criticises the established doctrines. Dharmakīrti (760 A.D.) takes the points more elaborately relating to *āgama*, *apauruṣeyatva*, validity and the relation in between a word and its meaning ⁴¹ and condemns them. M and P are extremely precise and borrow only a few relevant points from them.

M does not include the divine origin of castes and the hypothesis that the *yajñas* like *aśvamedha* etc. only are the *dharma* in his verses 166 & 167 to repudiate, but P takes up the points in his V. Condemnation of caste system originates from the very Pāli and Sanskrit Tripiṭakas. The difference among the *varṇas* and the superiority of *Brāhmaṇas* to other *varṇas* have already been criticised by the Buddha Himself in the *Suttanipāta* ⁴² and *Majjhimanikāya* ⁴³ respectively. The *Dhammapada* describes the characteristics of a

38. Cf. *Manusmṛti* 3.5, 11.58 etc.

(i) *atha hāsyā vedam upasṛjvatas trapu-jatubhyāṃ śrotaraparipūrṇam, udāharāṇe jihvācchedo, dhārāṇe śarīrabhedah. Gautama Dharma Sūtra* 2.3.4 ed. Vanamala Bhawalkar, Sagar, 1962.

(ii) *strīśūdradvijabandhūnāṃ trayī na śrutigocarā /parmaśreyasi mādhūnāṃ śrey evaṃ bhaved iha. // Śrīmadbhāgavatamahāpurāṇam, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, V.E. 2010, 1.4.25.*

(iii) *Manusmṛti* 10.1.

39. *Tattvasaṅgrahaḥ*, ed. Swamī Dwarikadas Shastri, Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi, 1997, Vol. I, *śloka*s 128-152.

40. *Ibid.*, *śloka*s 866-1210.

41. *Pramāṇavārtika*, S.D.D. Shastri, Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi, 1994, Chapter 3.213-340.

42. *Suttanipāta* XXX 3-37, 57-59, PTS, London.

43. *Majjhimanikāya* II. 5-3, *ibid.*

Brāhmaṇa in its *Brāhmaṇavaggo*. *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* ⁴⁴ & *Aśokāvadāna* ⁴⁵ also deal with the Buddhist stand. Aśvaghoṣa demonstrates that a *Brāhmaṇa* can not be distinguished on the basis of *jīva* (soul), *jāti* (birth), *śarīra* (body), *jñāna* (knowledge) *ācāra* (conduct), *karma* (occupation) or *veda* (the knowledge) of Vedas ⁴⁶. P very boldly borrows not only the logic but also the analogical examples from Aśvaghoṣa. P mentions a very rare reference of colours white (*śveta*), red (*rakta*), yellow (*pīta*) and black (*kṛṣṇa*) to the four *varṇas* *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra* respectively - *aparo'pi śveta-rakta-pīta-kṛṣṇavarṇabheda bhedo na drśyate* ⁴⁷. Certainly this reference condemns the idea as presented in the *Padmapurāṇa* (*svargakhaṇḍa* chap. 25) ⁴⁸. *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* of Jaimini (6.1.25-38) and *Brahmasūtras* of Vyāsa (1.3.34-38) devoted full *adhikaraṇa* as the *apaśūdrādhikaraṇa* and deal with all the dark and bright parts of *Sūtras*. Their commentators have discussed very much on this topic. However, studies of some modern writers shed more light on this issue ⁴⁹. P very abruptly comes to the third point of the *brahmanata* i. e. the result of *yāgas* like *aśvamedha* etc. and does not launch his views to contradict but quotes *Śuka* (*Śukra*) who had already condemned killing animals in the *yajñas*. The *Āśvamedhika Parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* may also be referred to. In the end he concludes, "Therefore, Veda is not self-originated, mouth etc. is not the *yonī* of human beings, and that *yajñas* like *aśvamedha* etc. only are not *dharma*" ⁵⁰.

44. The *Divyāvadāna*, ed. E. B. Cowel & Neil (reprint) Indological Book House, Delhi, 1987, p. 622 &c.

45. Ibid., p. 383.

46. *tasmān na jātir na jīvo na śarīraṇi na jñānaṇi, nācaro na karma na vedo brāhmaṇa iti*.

Vajrasūcī ed. Lallanji Gopal, Mahabodhi Society of India, Sarnath, Varanasi, 1995, p. 45.

47. Op. cit., p. 261.

48. quoted in *Śabdakalpadrumaḥ*, Vol. IV of Syārarājā Rādhākāntadevaḥ, CSS Office, Varanasi, 1964.

49. (a) Ghurye, G. S., *Caste and Class in Ancient India*, Popular Book House, Bombay, 1957,

(b) Datta, N. K., *Origin & Growth of Caste in India*, Vol. I, The Book Company Ltd. Calcutta, 1931.

50. *tasmān na vedaḥ svayambhūḥ, na mukhādir yonir janasya, nāśvamedhāt parato dharmo'nya iti; sarvaṇi pralāpaṇi nirarthakaṇi vicāryamāṇaṇi iti brahmanata*, op. cit., p. 262.

In the following four verses (168-171) P in full conformity with M condemns *vaiṣṇavamata* and the *īśvaramata* together. Thus eight principles of the former *kartā* etc. and ten of the latter *saṃmārga* etc. should be taken jointly and refuted one after the other. P had already resolved that agent (*kartā*), self (*ātman*), action (*karma*), time (*kālaḥ*), attributes of nature (*prakṛti-guṇas*), voidness of the nihilistic nature (*śūnyatā naṣṭadharmā*), emancipation (*nirvāṇa*) as the last stage, should be taken together with six paths (*ṣaṣṭmārga*) etc.⁵¹ But out of these eighteen categories firstly the omnipotence and independent creation of the universe have been rejected in verses 168 and 169 on the basis of the theory of dependent origination (= *pratītyasamutpāda*) discussed in verse 170. Thus dispensability and incausitivity of all the causes *īśvara* etc. is refuted⁵². Further dealing with the causation, though not mentioned by M, P handles the *Sāṃkhya* theory of causation - *satkārya-vāda* and refutes all the grounds of its establishment. Words coincide with those of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa⁵³. At the last P proves that the eternity of the agent (*kartā*), and cause is fake - *siddham kartṛkāraṇanīyatādūṣaṇam iti*⁵⁴. Again in the verse 171, omnipresence, immanence and consciousness of the Self are refuted, although these attributes have not been ascribed to *ātman* while dealing with the *brahmaviṣṇumatam* in verse no 162. It is amazing that no point from the verse 163, giving the precepts of the *īśvaramata* has been touched even. It appears that P does not refute *īśvaramata* as presented by M and himself, but the concept of *ātman* and its attributes as presented by the *Naiyāyikas*. Ratnakīrti⁵⁵ (1000 A.D.) and Jñānaśrīmitra's⁵⁶ (1040 A.D.) refutation of *ātman* was seriously condemned by Udayana⁵⁷ (11th c. A.D.) later on, even

51. *kartā ātmā karma kālaḥ prakṛti-guṇāḥ śūnyatā naṣṭadharmā nirvāṇam kāṣṭhāvasthātā, dhīḥ sārḍham saṃmārgādīkam veditavyam iti niyamah*, *ibid.*, p. 258.

52. *evaṃ sarveṣāṃ īśvarādīnāṃ kāraṇānāṃ anīyatattvam akāraṇattvam siddham*, *ibid.*, p. 263.

53. *asad akaraṇād upādānagrahanāt sarvasambhavābhāvāt / śaktasya śakyakaraṇāt kāraṇabhāvāt ca satkāryam // 9.*

54. *Op. cit.*, p. 264.

55. *Īśvarasādhana-dūṣaṇam* in *Ramakīrtinibandhāvalīḥ*, KPJRI, Patna, 1975.

56. *Īśvaravādah* in *Jñānaśrīmitranibandhāvalīḥ*, KPJRI, Patna, 1987.

57. *kāryāyojanadhrtyādeḥ padāt pratyayataḥ śruteḥ / vākyāt saṃkhyāviśeṣāt ca sadhyo viśvavid avyayaḥ //*

before M & P. In the continuation the fundamentals of Buddhist philosophy have been put forward again which relate to the Buddhist concept of the self, the world, the fruits of merits and demerits etc., which go against those of the *Naiyāyikas*. Thus the author and the commentator both condemn such points which were not established earlier in the text. Śāntarakṣita⁵⁸ condemns *īśvara* and *ātman* as established by the *Naiyāyikas* and *Vaiśeṣikas* (verses 171-221), *Mīmāṃsakas* (verses 222-248), *Kāpilas* (verses 248-310), and *Aupanīśadikas* (verses 328-335). Likewise Dharmakīrti⁵⁹ also repudiated *īśvara*, established in *Nyāya* and *Sāṃkhya*, in the verses 12-18 and 19-30 respectively of the first chapter.

Thereafter in verse 173 M very precisely condemns the doctrines of his own sister-institutions i. e. *Vaiśeṣika*, *Sautrāntika* and *Yogācāra* which has been very extensively commented upon by P⁶⁰ on the lines of Śāntarakṣita⁶¹ who refuted the *vātsīputrīyas*, (verses 336-349), *traikālyavādins* (verses 1784-1855) and *bahirarthavādins* (verses 1964-2083). P frequently borrows the logic from his predecessors while refuting the three Buddhist schools of philosophy.

In verse 174 the doctrines of *Islam* (= *Tāzins*) that 1. one experiences here the results of the actions performed in previous lives, 2. and those of this life in the next. If it be so the fruits of actions may not come to cessation in lives after lives, have been condemned, as one may not go out of the world even after innumerable lives, nor may enter liberation. This is the principle of *Tāzins* who do not believe in rebirth but either go to Hell or to Heaven and suffer or enjoy accordingly. Thus their theory of no-rebirth is repudiated. Certainly these are the principles of *Islam*, but not mentioned earlier in verse number 164.

In the next verse 165 the doctrine of *Cārvākas* that the conscious mind with senses emerges from the combination of the five gross ele-

Nyāyakusumāñjali 5.1, ed. M.P.L. Goswami, Mithilāvidyāpīṭha, Darbhanga, 1972.

58. Op. cit.

59. Op. cit.

60. *viśtaro 'nekā'nekapramāṇaśāstreṇa madhyamakena nirākaraṇīyas tīrthikāṇāṃ siddhāntaḥ, yaḥ samvṛtyā vivṛtyā vā sambuddhavadānasamaḥ, sa na dūṣaṇīyah iti Kālacakra Ādibuddhabhagavato nīyamaḥ*, op. cit., p. 270.

61. Op. cit.

ments, like toxication in wine from different compounds, is refuted, as consciousness does not originate among the stables tree etc. from the same elements. Therefore, the theory of the emergence of consciousness from the combination of gross elements, as held by *Cārvākas*, is invalid. Here, too, it can be noticed that the theory of the emergence of consciousness has not been mentioned by M and P both earlier in the first half of the verse 164.

In the following verse the eternal Self of *Kṣapaṇakas* has been rejected on several grounds, the *sukhapada* (abode of pleasure), life in vegetation etc. are also logically refuted by M and finely added by P.

Having condemned the heretic views, P suggests to repudiate the doctrines of the *īrthikas* on the basis of the texts of the *madhyamaka* logic. However, the agreeable doctrines of the heretics need not be condemned which go in full conformity with M.

In verse 178 a few doctrines of the Vedicists are refuted again and the King has been advised to adopt the *Bauddha* doctrines for the benefit of beings.

It may be concluded that for reasons unknown to us the author and the commentator both could not do full justice to the topics systematically. Both may be at times quixotic, presenting imaginary precepts or like the Jaina masters Guṇaratna⁶² & Rājaśekhara⁶³ might have learnt the dogmas as they 'saw and heard' but not read the relevant texts.

It is mere a surprise that other systems of Indian philosophy like *Śāṅkara vedānta*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Pātañjalayoga*, different established schools of *Vaiṣṇavism* and *Śaivism* have not been touched even, though they flourished before the commencement of the root text and the commentary i. e. LKT & V.

62. *idaṃ mayā yathāśrutaṃ yathādṛṣṭaṃ cātrābhidadhe*, op.cit. p. 91.

63. *śrutānusārataḥ proktaṃ.....*

eteṣāṃ eva śāstrebhyaḥ tāṃs tāṃs bhāvān vidur budhāḥ.

op. cit., p. 110.

Appendix
**(Relevant verses of the Svaparadarsauanyāyavicāramahoddeśaḥ
 of LKT)**

nairātmyaṇi karmapākas tribhavarūgatir dvādaśāṅgapratīteḥ
 sambhūtir vedasatyam dviguṇitanavakā' venikā buddhadharmāḥ /
 pañcaskandhās trikāyāḥ sahaja iti tathaivājadā śūnyatā ca
 yasmim etad vadanti prakāṭitanīyatā deśanā vajrināḥ sā //161//

yasmin vedāḥ svayambhūr mukhakaracaranādaḥ ca yonir janasya
 nānyo dharmo' śvamedhāt para iti ca bhaved deśanā brahmaṇāḥ sā /
 kartā' tmā karma kālāḥ prakṛtir api guṇāḥ śūnyatā naṣṭadharmā
 kartā hetuḥ phalasya prakāṭitanīyatā deśanā sātra viśṇoḥ //162//

śaṇmārgāḥ pañca tattvaṃ parapadam akhilaṃ cāparaṃ mantradehaṃ
 vidyātmā sacchivatvaṃ trividhapadagater yojanaṃ tyāgabdhāvaḥ /
 bindor bhedaṃ śivatvaṃ sakalatanugataṃ dvādaśagranthibhedāḥ
 etat sarvaṃ hi yatra prabhavati niyatā deśanā sā śivasya //163//

nāstīśaḥ karmapāko'pi ca guṇaviśayān bhūtavṛndam hi bhuñkte
 tasyābhāve phalaṃ na sphuṭam amaraguroḥ deśanā veditavyā /
 kartrā sṛṣṭaṃ samastaṃ sacaram acarajaṃ tāzināṃ bhuktihetoh
 svargas tasya pratośād bhavati khalu nṛṇāṃ deśanā rahmaṇāḥ sā //164//

traikālyam dravyaśaṭkaṃ navapadavihitam jīvaśaṭkāyaleśāḥ
 pañcānye santi kāyā vratasamitigatir jñānacāritrabhedāḥ /
 jīvaḥ kāyapramāṇo hy aparimitabhavair brahmacyena mokṣo
 yasmin mokṣapramāṇam hy upari nigaditam deśanā sā jinānām //165//

vedo'sau na svayambhūs tribhuvananilaye vedaśabdo'rthavācī
 brahmā vaktraiś caturbhiḥ prakāṭayati purā vedaśabdena cārtham /
 śabdasyārtho'py abhinnaś tv atha dahati mukhaṃ kin na śabdo'gnir uktaḥ
 tasmād vai deśako'py asty aviditaviśaye' nāgatārthe'py atīte //166//

vedo nākāśatulyaḥ kṛtaka iha mukhoccāritāḥ sthānabhedāt
 yuktyā prādeśikaś ca dvijamukhapaṭhitāḥ sarvago'nye paṭhanti /
 yasmād śūdrādijātīḥ paṭhati likhati nāsarvago veda eśaś
 tasmād vedaḥ pramāṇam na hi bhavati nṛṇāṃ jñānināṃ paṇḍitānām //167//

astiśaḥ sarvakartā yadi sa ca jagataḥ karmabhoktā na cānyaḥ
 nāpīśaḥ karmakartā yadi sa ca na bhavet sarvakartā samantāt /
 kartā'nyaḥ preṣitaḥ san yadi param aparādhināḥ kartur eṣā
 tasmāt kartā na ceśo' śubhaśubhaphaladaḥ prāṇinām karma muktva //168//

prthvītoyaṅnīvātāṇava iha yadi khe kartur ādau na santi
 dravyābhāve na viśvaṃ viśayavirahitaḥ sarvakartā karoti /
 na pratyakṣaṃ parokṣaṃ viśayavirahitasyāsya kartuḥ pramāṇaṃ
 saṃyogād eva sarvaṃ bhavati narapate necchayā karmarūpaṃ //169//

saṃyogād indukānter bhavati ca salilaṃ darpaṇe vastubimbaṃ
 jihvāsraṇo' mlahetoḥ svaravata itaraḥ śuddhabije'ñkuraḥ syāt /
 kāntāc cāyaḥśalākābhramaṇaṃ api bhaven necchayā kiñcid eṣāṃ
 vastūnām śaktir eṣā tribhuvanānilaye nirmitā kenacin na //170//

yady ātmā sarvagaḥ syād anubhavati kathaṃ bandhuviśeṣaduḥkhaṃ
 nityaś cāyaṃ yadi syān madanaśarahato' svasthatāṃ kiṃ prayāti /
 yady āsīt sakriyaś ca vrajati katham imāṃ mūḍhatām suptakāle
 evedaṃ vai sarvagaḥ syād vibhur api ca purā sakriyo'yaṃ na cātmā //171//

nāsty ātmā sambhavo vāsty aśubhaśubhaphalaṃ cāsti kartrā vihināṃ
 gantā nāsty asti mokṣāya gamanam akhilaṃ cāsti bandho na bandhyaḥ /
 bhāvo' bhāvo'pi cāsti kṣaṇikavirahito niḥsvabhāvo bhavo'sti
 etan me satyavākyaṃ surphaṇivacanaiḥ saṅgrahair hanyate na //172//

yas tattvaṃ pudgalākhyam vadati tanugataṃ tatsvabhāvāt sa naṣṭaḥ
 saṃvṛtyā cārthavādī tv aviditaparamārtho hy asan manyamānaḥ /
 vijñānaṃ manyamānas tribhuvanasakalaṃ caiva vijñānavādī
 yo'naṣṭo naṣṭapakṣaḥ sa bhavati karuṇāśūnyatādvaitavādī // 173//

jantuḥ pūrvāṇi karmāṇy anubhavati kṛtāny aihikāṇy anyajātyā
 yady evaṃ karmanāśo na hi bhavati nṛṇām jātijātyantareṇa /
 saṃsārān nirgamaḥ syād aparimitabhavair naiva mokṣapraveśaḥ
 etad vai tāzinām tu prabhavati hi mataṃ cānyajātiprahiṇaṃ //174//

bhūtair yady ekabhūtaiḥ prabhavati madirāśaktivat sāksi cittam
 vṛkṣāṇām kin na hi syāt kṣitijalabhubhugmārutākāśayogāt /
 nāsty eṣāṃ jantuśaktis tv atha paramamṛṣā bhūtasamyoگاśaktir
 etac cārvākavākyaṃ na hi sukhaphaladaṃ mārganaṣṭaṃ narāṇām //175//

jīvaḥ kāyapramāṇo yadi karacaraṇacchedanān naśyate kiṃ
 nityaḥ kāyaprabhāvād aṇur api ca bhavet sthūlatāṃ kiṃ prayāti /
 saṃsārāt karmamukto vrajati sukhapadaṃ yat sthitaṃ lokamūrdhni
 trailokyaṃ cāṇubhir yad racitaṃ api sadā śāśvataṃ tan na kālāt //176//

ityādijñānahetoḥ prakatayati mahau-deśanāṃ kālacakraḥ ———
 purnsāṃ cittānusāraṃ mṛdukathinaparāṃ vāsanāyāḥ balena /
 cittaṃ vai bhāvarāgaḥ sphāṭikavad upadhād rāgatāṃ yāti yasmāt
 tasmād dharmo na kaścit svaparakulagato yoginā dūṣaṇīyaḥ //177//

dharmāḥ sattvopakāro viśayavirahitaś cāpakāro'py adharmāḥ
 himsā vedapramāṇā na hi sukhaphaladā duḥkhadā sarvakālam /
 sanmaiṭrī mūrkhavākyāt paramasukhakarā sarvasattvānusaktā
 tasmāt satvārtham ekaṃ kuru nṛpa manasā bhāvanāṃ niḥsvabhāvām //178//

indro'haṃ svargaloke tridaśanaragurur bhūtale cakravartī
 pātāle nāgarājaḥ phaṇikulanamitaḥ sarvagas cottamo'ham /
 jñānaṃ buddho munīndro kṣaraparamavibhur yogināṃ vajrayogo
 vedo'ṅkāraḥ pavitro vraja mama śaraṇaṃ sarvabhāvena rājan //179//

tvam mātā tvam pitā tvam jagati gurur api tvam ca bandhuḥ sumitraṃ
 tvam nāthas tvam vidhātā hi tvam aghaharaṇas tvam padaṃ sampadāṃ ca /
 tvam kaivalyaṃ padaṃ tvam varaguṇanilayo dhvastadoṣas tvam eva
 tvam dīnānātha cintāmaṇir api śaraṇaṃ tvam gato'haṃ jinendra //180//